

REMARKS

A non-final Office Action, dated June 22, 2005, rejects pending claims 1, 4 and 5, and objects to claim 2, 3, and 6-20. Claims 1-5 have been amended herein and new claims 21-32 have been added herein. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Drawing Objections

Applicant has concurrently submitted herewith a complete set of corrected drawings marked as "REPLACEMENT SHEETS." These drawings now show element numbers 76 (Figs. 2-4) and 110 (Figs. 5 & 7) as described in the specification. Element 72b was incorrectly identified as element "72d" on page 7, line 11 of the specification. Accordingly, the paragraph of the specification containing this error has been replaced herein. The drawings should now be in condition for allowance.

Allowable Subject Matter

The examiner's Office Action indicates that claim 2 and 3 would be allowed if amended to place them into independent format and to include all the limitations of their base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant has so amended these claims. Accordingly, they should now be in condition for allowance. Moreover, new dependent claims 25-32 depend on one of these now allowable independent claims. Accordingly, they too should now be in condition for allowance.

35 USC § 102(b)

Applicants respectfully traverse the examiner's rejection of claims 1, 4 and 5 as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 4,404,507 to Reise ("Reise"). Essential elements of these claims are missing from Reise.

A. Reise neither teaches nor suggests use on a "Fifth-Wheel Trailer"

Claims 1, 4 & 5 call for a trailer stabilizing device for use on "a fifth-wheel trailer" with the device extending between a towing vehicle and "the fifth-wheel trailer." (emphasis added). Reise neither teaches nor suggests such a structure. Accordingly, since this essential element of claim 1, 4 and 5 is missing from Reise, Reise cannot anticipate these claims and they should be allowed.

Moreover, since claims 2-24 depend on allowable claims 1 or 4, they too should now be in condition for allowance.

- B. Reise neither teaches nor suggests a dampener extending between the towing vehicle and the trailer.

In addition, claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the trailer-stabilizing device is preferably accomplished by operably connecting "a dampener" to the towing vehicle and the trailer. (emphasis added). A preferred embodiment of the present invention discloses using a piston-type structure as such a dampener. (element 90, Figs. 5-7). In contrast, no such dampener is disclosed or suggested in Reise.

Reise's "hydraulic unit" (element 1, Fig. 2 of Reise) is not a dampener. Rather, it serves as a mechanical sensing device for trailer sway that activates the trailer's brakes by opening brake fluid valves as needed. Reise actually teaches away from using its "hydraulic unit" as a dampener to control sway. "The hydraulic unit 1 is similar to a shock absorber except that the fluid escapement orifice in the piston or at each end of the cylinder is such that the force required to elongate the unit is essentially the same as that required to compress or shorten the unit." (Reise, Col. 2, lines 43-48.).


Since Reise is missing this essential element of claim 1, it cannot anticipate or otherwise render obvious claim 1, as currently amended. Moreover, since claims 21-24 depend on allowable claims 1, they too should be in condition for allowance.

In view of the foregoing, applicant submits that all of the currently pending claims are in condition for allowance, and respectfully requests that the case be passed to issuance. If the Examiner has any questions, he is invited to contact applicants' attorney at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

December 21, 2005

By


John R. Dawson
Registration No. 39,504

ipsolon llp
805 SW Broadway # 2740
Portland, Oregon 97205
Phone No. (503) 419-0702
Fax No. (503) 249-7068
E-Mail: john@ipsolon.com